

Joint Backhaul-Access Analysis of Full Duplex Self-Backhauling Heterogeneous Networks

Ankit Sharma, Radha Krishna Ganti and J. Klutto Milleth

Abstract

With the successful demonstration of in-band full-duplex (IBFD) transceivers, a new research dimension has been added to wireless networks. This paper proposes an interesting use case of this capability for IBFD self-backhauling heterogeneous networks (HetNet). IBFD self-backhauling in a HetNet refers to IBFD-enabled small cells backhauling themselves with macro cells over the wireless channel. Owing to their IBFD capability, the small cells simultaneously communicate over the access and backhaul links, using the same frequency band. The idea is doubly advantageous, as it obviates the need for fiber backhauling small cells every hundred meters and allows the access spectrum to be reused for backhauling at no extra cost. This work considers the case of a two-tier cellular network with IBFD-enabled small cells, wirelessly backhauling themselves with conventional macro cells. For clear exposition, the case considered is that of FDD network, where within access and backhaul links, the downlink (DL) and uplink (UL) are frequency duplexed (f_1 , f_2 respectively), while the total frequency spectrum used at access and backhaul ($f_1 + f_2$) is the same. Analytical expressions for coverage and average downlink (DL) rate in such a network are derived using tools from the field of *stochastic geometry*. It is shown that DL rate in such networks could be close to double that of a conventional TDD/FDD self-backhauling network, at the expense of reduced coverage due to higher interference in IBFD networks. For the proposed IBFD network, the conflicting aspects of increased interference on one side and high spectral efficiency on the other are captured into a mathematical model. The mathematical model introduces an end-to-end joint analysis of backhaul (or fronthaul) and access links, in contrast to the largely available access-centric studies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Capacity demands in a wireless cellular system have been increasing at a rapid pace. The next move towards 5G network aims at increasing capacity of the current systems thousand

Ankit Sharma and Radha Krishna Ganti are with the Electrical Engineering Department at Indian Institute of Technology, Madras. Their contact emails are {ankitsharma, rganti}@ee.iitm.ac.in. J. Klutto Milleth is with Center of Excellence in Wireless Technology, IIT-Madras Research Park. His contact email is klutto@cewit.org.in

fold [1]. Since bandwidth demands have ever been exceeding the available spectrum, frequency reuse techniques are becoming increasingly important for cellular systems. The well studied dense heterogeneous network (HetNet) [2] is one of the methods to increase capacity for future networks. Typically, HetNet consists of a macro base-station (M-BS) tier, serving high mobility users overlaid with operator deployed pico base-station (P-BS) tier (a.k.a. small cells) [3] for low mobility, dense user areas. Deploying a highly dense network of P-BSs is becoming increasingly worrisome [4] for operators. This is because fiber backhauling such P-BSs placed every few tens of meters is not a practically and economically viable option, especially in developing countries like India. The alternative is to employ wireless backhauling. Though wireless backhauling obviates the need for laying down high-speed/fiber links, it needs the operator to partition their highly priced spectrum into orthogonal access and backhauling resources, thereby resulting in lower spectral usage for user access. In-band full-duplex (IBFD) systems—another frequency reuse technique—present a scheme to wirelessly backhaul P-BSs with M-BSs without having to orthogonalize allocated spectrum between access and backhaul. The scheme consists of a two-tier cellular network where the P-BSs, being IBFD-enabled, backhaul themselves wirelessly with the M-BSs, which themselves are fiber-backhauled to the core network. The M-BSs exchange backhaul data with the P-BSs on the entire spectrum that the P-BSs use to transmit data to the users. M-BSs may also serve the users directly. This results in a nice amalgamation of two frequency reuse techniques working in tandem. Practical IBFD radio systems ([5] and [6]) have already been demonstrated, albeit with certain transmit power constraints. Since almost all modern communication standards such as the IEEE 802.11 and 3GPP LTE have been established with the basic premise of conventional TDD/FDD¹ capability, novel methods and schemes are needed to efficiently utilize the potential of such IBFD radios. To that end, this paper analyzes and gives key design insights for a future cellular network that leverages the efficiency of IBFD radios used in a wirelessly backhauled two-tier HetNet.

¹Since the paper proposes a two-tier HetNet based on FDD, comparison of IBFD networks will be done with the conventional FDD systems throughout the paper. The term *conventional FDD system* is used for a conventional system operating on FDD mode with no station having IBFD capability.

A. Related Work

For a self-backhauled two-tier HetNet, a model for joint analysis of backhaul-access links is required, which is a rather less studied topic. The topic finds mention in [7], where it is listed as one of the potential applications of IBFD radios. Work in [8] is an attempt in this direction, though the work develops on the basic assumption of one P-BS per user and inter P-BS interference has not been considered. Moreover, the paper only presents capacity results as a function of physical separation between the P-BS and M-BS while the overall coverage trends in such a two-tier network have not been analyzed. Perhaps a closely related work in this direction is found in [9], where the authors model a multiple-input-multiple-output (MIMO) IBFD P-BS and HD backhauling M-BS. The M-BSs only play the role of backhaul aggregators and do not provide access communication to users. The probability of successful transmissions is modeled as a product of independent successful transmissions for first hop (M-BS to P-BS) and second hop (P-BS to user) in the downlink (DL). This might not be always true of real systems where there might be dependence between the two probabilities. Also, the aggregate rate characterization from the M-BS to the user has not been detailed. Other works like [10] analyze an IBFD network for parameters like rate but only for a single-tier network. They allocate same channels to both uplink (UL) and DL of base station-to-user link and compute the parameters thereof. Work in [11] discusses the optimal power allocation strategy in IBFD networks using relays. The work builds on a cognitive setup with primary and secondary nodes in general. Interference is then controlled from primary transmitters to secondary receivers. The approach is modeled as an optimization problem for transmit powers of primary and secondary transmitters. Works in [12] and [13] discuss about bringing in MIMO and beamforming on IBFD radios and the benefits thereof, though [12] uses only a single tier. Two interesting analyses are offered through works in [14] and [15] where the authors argue the use of IBFD at all. The authors pitch the use case of using multiple antennas for the conventional HD multiple-input-multiple-output (MIMO) operation versus using the antennas for IBFD operation. In fact, most of the cases discuss only the access link optimization. Another relevant study in self-backhauling is the recent work in [16]. The authors present the system level coverage and rate results in a mesh network of base-stations (BS) with wired backhaul, providing wireless backhauling for BSs without wired backhaul. However, the study is done for millimeter-wave networks without IBFD capability.

B. Our approach and novelty

The paper proposes a two-tier network consisting of IBFD-enabled P-BSs and conventional M-BSs. It analyzes the performance of the system in the DL. The setup consists of P-BSs being wirelessly backhauled by the M-BSs. Since the P-BSs are IBFD-enabled, they use the same set of frequencies to backhaul themselves on the DL and UL with the M-BS, as the ones they use in the DL and UL access links to the users (say, f_1 and f_2 be the DL and UL frequency for the P-BS to user (and M-BS to P-BS in backhaul) link and user to P-BS (and P-BS to M-BS in backhaul) link transmissions). The M-BSs being conventional non-IBFD stations, need to bifurcate frequency resources between backhaul and access links. For 1 Hz of bandwidth, the M-BSs use η Hz ($0 \leq \eta \leq 1$) for backhauling and $(1 - \eta)$ Hz for direct access links to users. It is interesting to note that the design fits *as-is* for a frequency division duplexed (IBFD) network and could be tailored to suit other networks, such as TDD as well. Moreover, the design requires only the P-BSs to be IBFD, while the user devices and M-BS could work on legacy FDD mode (refer Fig. 1).

For the given two-tier network, spatial Poisson Point Process (PPP) ([17] and [18]) is used for the spatial distribution of nodes. Coverage probability and average conditional rate expressions for a user located at the origin are then derived. Average conditional rates imply the average achieved rate for a user, given that the user is covered (under P-BS or M-BS). In [19] the coverage probability was obtained in a general K-tier HetNet, but without any dependence between the tiers themselves. In this work, coverage under P-BS is modeled as a joint probability rather than independent tier-level coverage probabilities. That is to say, a user associated to a P-BS is declared covered only if it receives a certain minimum signal power from the P-BS and the P-BS itself receives a certain minimum signal power from the M-BS. As a next step, the rates are also modeled as a *minimum* over the rates from M-BS to P-BS and P-BS to user. Such expressions are particularly useful for joint access-backhaul analysis and more so, in the case of proposed IBFD networks. Since the backhaul links are also active over the wireless channel, interference to access links of users is enhanced and the coverage degrades. On the other hand, reusing the same spectrum in an IBFD setting tends to double the spectral efficiency of the system. The work models and details the way these two contrasting factors affect the overall system behavior.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

The system model considered in this paper is described in the following sub-sections.

A. Spatial arrangement of base-stations

The location of the M-BSs and P-BSs are assumed to follow independent Poisson point processes $\Phi_m \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\Phi_s \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with densities λ_m and λ_s , respectively. The transmit powers of the M-BS and P-BS tier are assumed to be P_m and P_s respectively. Small scale fading between any pair of nodes is assumed to be independent and Rayleigh distributed. The fading power (square of the small scale fading) between nodes located at points x and y in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is denoted by h_{xy} and is exponentially distributed, also with unit mean. Basic large scale path loss function is used, i.e., the power received at distance r when transmitting at unity power is given as $r^{-\alpha}$, where $\alpha > 2$ is the path loss exponent. The path loss exponent is assumed same for both the tiers, though the analysis is easily extendable to unequal path loss constants. Without loss of generality, a typical user located at the origin is considered and the performance of this typical user in the DL is analyzed.

B. Association Model

The association rule is based on the maximum average received biased power as discussed in [20]. Biasing a user to associate with a P-BS even if the received power from a M-BS is higher, helps offload traffic from the M-BSs. Hence, for BS association, the average received biased power at the typical user is $P_s B_s \|x_s\|^{-\alpha}$ and $P_m B_m \|x_m\|^{-\alpha}$ for P-BS and M-BS respectively, where B_s and B_m , and x_m and x_s represent their respective biases and distances from the typical user at the origin. Let $x_{m,min}$ and $x_{s,min}$ denote the distance of the closest M-BS and P-BS respectively to the user at the origin. Then the user connects to the P-BS if $x_{s,min} \leq \Delta x_{m,min}$ and to the closest M-BS, otherwise. Here $\Delta = ((P_s B_s)/(P_m B_m))^{1/\alpha}$, is the effective bias factor. Let ε_m and ε_s denote the events of M-BS and P-BS association, respectively. Then the corresponding probabilities of association are given in [20] as,

$$\Pr(\varepsilon_s) = \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda_s + \Delta^{-2}\lambda_m}, \quad \Pr(\varepsilon_m) = \frac{\Delta^{-2}\lambda_m}{\lambda_s + \Delta^{-2}\lambda_m}. \quad (1)$$

C. Bandwidth Allocation

Bandwidth allocation between the P-BS and M-BS tiers is discussed next, considering $2W$ Hz of allocated spectrum.

Full-Duplex Bandwidth Allocation: For IBFD networks, the available spectrum of $2W$ Hz is allocated as:

- 1) The entire $2W$ Hz is used by P-BSs and M-BSs.
- 2) Within each tier, $2W$ Hz is divided into UL and DL resources utilizing W Hz each (as for conventional FDD).
- 3) At the M-BSs (being non-IBFD), W Hz is further sub-divided as ηW Hz and $(1 - \eta)W$ Hz, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, for backhaul and access resources respectively.
- 4) Also, each M-BS to P-BS link is limited in bandwidth to $\left(\frac{\eta}{n}\right) W$ Hz, considering each M-BS backhauls $n = \lambda_s/\lambda_m$ P-BSs on an average.

Half-Duplex Bandwidth Allocation: For conventional FDD networks, the available $2W$ Hz is allocated as:

- 1) $\beta 2W$ Hz and $(1 - \beta)(2W)$ Hz, $0 \leq \beta < 1$, partitioned between M-BSs and P-BSs respectively. Typically, $\beta = 0.5$, so each tier gets W Hz. Notice that this is in contrast to both the tiers getting the entire $2W$ Hz in IBFD case.
- 2) At each tier, W Hz is divided into UL and DL resources utilizing $W/2$ Hz each.
- 3) At the M-BSs, $W/2$ Hz is further sub-divided as $\eta W/2$ Hz and $(1 - \eta)W/2$ Hz, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, for backhauling and access resources respectively.
- 4) Also, each M-BS to P-BS link is limited in bandwidth to $\left(\frac{\eta}{n}\right) W/2$ Hz, considering each M-BS backhauls $n = \lambda_s/\lambda_m$ P-BSs on an average.

Taking the case of an IBFD system, the proposed frequency allocation plan is depicted in Fig. 1. For conventional FDD system the frequency plan is well known and depicted in Fig. 2. The figures denote DL and UL carriers as $f1$ and $f2$ respectively, that are centered about the bandwidth of W Hz and $W/2$ Hz in IBFD and conventional FDD case respectively. In IBFD systems, both P-BSs and M-BSs use the total available spectrum but interference is more, as shown by the thick broken lines in Fig. 1. For conventional FDD systems, though the interferers are only the nodes belonging to the tier to which the user is associated, the total available spectrum is partitioned between the M-BS and P-BS.

D. Signal-to-Interference Ratio

An interference limited network is assumed and signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio is replaced with signal-to-interference (SIR) ratio [19] as the measure of performance.




Fig. 1: DL interference in IBFD system. Total spectrum = $2W$ Hz. Each link represents a bandwidth of W Hz. For instance, the DL backhaul link is centered around f_1 Hz and has a bandwidth of W Hz. Users attached to either P-BS or M-BS receive interference from both the tiers. The given spectrum though, is entirely used by both the tiers.




Fig. 2: DL interference in conventional FDD system. Total spectrum = $2W$ Hz. Each link represents a bandwidth of $W/2$ Hz. For instance, the DL backhaul link is centered around f_1 Hz and has a bandwidth of $W/2$ Hz. Users attached to a tier (P-BS or M-BS) receive interference from only from that tier. However, the given spectrum needs to be partitioned between the tiers.

1) *Small cell association:* Consider a typical user at the origin associated with a P-BS. Let point $r_s \in \Phi_s$ denote this closest P-BS to the typical user. Let the point $r_m \in \Phi_m$ denote the closest M-BS to the aforementioned P-BS. The P-BS associates with the closest M-BS for

backhaul. Let SIR_{us} denote SIR of the signal from the P-BS to the user in DL access. Then

$$\text{SIR}_{us}(r_s, r_m) = \frac{P_s h_{or_s} \|r_s\|^{-\alpha}}{I_s(o) + I_m(o) + P_m h_{or_m} \|r_m\|^{-\alpha}} \quad (2)$$

where,

$$I_s(x) = \sum_{z \in \Phi_s \cap B(o, r_s)^c} P_s h_{xz} \|z - x\|^{-\alpha},$$

is the interference from other P-BSs to a user located at a point x in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $B(o, r_s)$ denotes a disc centered at origin o , having radius r_s and $B(o, r_s)^c$ denotes its complement. The interference from the M-BS to a user located at a point x in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is

$$I_m(x) = \sum_{z \in \Phi_m \cap \mathcal{M}} P_m h_{xz} \|z - x\|^{-\alpha},$$

where $\mathcal{M} = (B(o, r_s \Delta^{-1}) \cup B(r_s, \|r_m - r_s\|))^c$, and the discs are assumed to be open sets. The SIR of the signal from the M-BS to the P-BS in DL backhaul is then given as,

$$\text{SIR}_{sm}(r_s, r_m) = \frac{P_m h_{r_s r_m} \|r_m - r_s\|^{-\alpha}}{I_s(r_s) + I_m(r_s) + \beta P_m}, \quad (3)$$

where the residual self-interference generated by the P-BS, being IBFD, is modeled as βP_m , β being a factor controlling the amount of self-interference. Though the self-interference channel in some of the recent literature ([9], [21]) has been modeled as a Rician fading channel [22], this paper focuses on a much simpler model. The idea is to get a handle on network coverage and rates given an ideal self-interference suppressing IBFD radio, than to quantify the self-interference suppression capability of an IBFD radio.

2) *Macro cell association:* Assume that the typical user at the origin is associated to an M-BS denoted by point at $r'_m \in \Phi_m$. Let SIR_{um} denote the SIR of the signal from the M-BS to the user in DL access and is given by

$$\text{SIR}_{um}(r'_m) = \frac{P_m h_{or'_m} \|r'_m\|^{-\alpha}}{\hat{I}_s(o) + \hat{I}_m(o)}. \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{I}_s(o) = \sum_{z \in \Phi_s \cap B(o, \Delta r'_m)^c} P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha}$ and $\hat{I}_m(o) = \sum_{z \in \Phi_m \cap B(o, r'_m)^c} P_m h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha}$. The next section analyzes coverage probability of a typical user in the given network.

III. COVERAGE

Coverage probability is defined as the probability that a randomly chosen user in the given network achieves an $\text{SIR} > \theta$. In the proposed setup, the effective coverage for a P-BS associated

user would depend jointly on user to P-BS and P-BS to M-BS coverage probabilities denoted as $P_{u,s}(\theta)$, $P_{s,m}(\theta)$. For an M-BS associated user, coverage would only depend on the user to M-BS coverage probability denoted as $P_{u,m}(\theta)$. Let T_s , T_b and T_m be the SIR coverage thresholds for user to P-BS, P-BS to M-BS and user to M-BS links respectively. Using (1), the effective coverage probability for a user, $P_u^x(T_s, T_b, T_m)$, can now be defined as

$$P_u^x(T_s, T_b, T_m) = \Pr(\varepsilon_s) \cdot \Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid \varepsilon_s) + \Pr(\varepsilon_m) \cdot \Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m \mid \varepsilon_m), \quad (5)$$

where ε_m and ε_s denote events of M-BS and P-BS association and $x \in \{f, h\}$ denoting IBFD (full-duplex) or conventional FDD (half-duplex) operation. The joint distribution of r_m and r_s , that will be used in the evaluation of coverage probability is discussed next.

A. Joint probability density function of distance pair (r_s, r_m)

As mentioned above, the coverage under P-BS association implies a joint coverage probability over user to P-BS and P-BS to its backhauling M-BS links. This entails deriving a joint probability density function (pdf) of the distance pair (r_s, r_m) with respect to a typical user at the origin. When the user associates with a P-BS, the joint pdf $f(r_s, r_m)$ is derived for a general $\Delta \geq 0$. In Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, the possible configurations of the user, P-BS and M-BS are shown for $\Delta \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \Delta < 1$, respectively. Instead of deriving the joint distribution




Fig. 3: Network Geometry for Event ε_s With $\Delta \geq 1$, i.e., user biased towards P-BS tier. When the user associates with a P-BS, coverage depends jointly on user to P-BS (for access) link and P-BS to M-BS (for backhaul) link. Given a P-BS S , found at distance r_s from O , the nearest M-BS to the user could be at a distance $\Delta^{-1}r_s$ from the origin O , denoted by OM' . The backhauling M-BS M could be found anywhere at a distance r_m from O , resulting in three different network geometries ((A), (B) and (C)) that define the joint density function of the P-BS and M-BS with respect to the typical user.

for (r_s, r_m) , an equivalent distribution of (r_s, r) is derived. This is because the term $\|r - r_s\|^{-\alpha}$

occurs repeatedly in the coverage expressions and the joint distribution on (r_s, r) simplifies the coverage expressions.

Lemma 1. *The joint density function of the access-backhaul distance pair, (r_s, r) , with respect to the typical user, given the bias factor $\Delta \geq 1$ is*

$$f(r_s, r) = \begin{cases} \frac{4\pi^2 \lambda_m (\Delta^2 \lambda_s + \lambda_m) r r_s e^{-\pi(\lambda_m r^2 + (\lambda_s + \lambda_m/\Delta^2)r_s^2)}}{\Delta^2}, & 0 < \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \\ \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\lambda_s \pi r_s^2} e^{\lambda_m \pi ((\Delta^{-1} r_s)^2 + r^2 - \text{lens}(M_1, M_2))} \right)}{\partial r_s \partial r}, & \|r_s\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \leq \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \\ 4\pi^2 \lambda_m \lambda_s r r_s e^{-\pi(\lambda_m r^2 + \lambda_s r_s^2)}, & \|r\| \geq \|r_s\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta}\right), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\text{lens}(M_1, M_2)$ denotes the area of the lens formed between the points M_1 and M_2 in Case (B) of Fig. 3.

Proof: See Appendix A ■




Fig. 4: Network Geometry for Event ε_s With $0 < \Delta < 1$. The figure is similar to Fig. 3, except that the user is biased towards the M-BS tier. Given the user associated P-BS is at a distance r_s from O , the nearest M-BS could only be at a distance $\geq \Delta^{-1} r_s$.

Lemma 2. *The joint density function of the access-backhaul distance pair, (r_s, r) , with respect to the typical user, given the bias factor $\Delta < 1$ is*

$$f(r_s, r) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 < \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} - 1\right) \\ \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\lambda_s \pi r_s^2} e^{\lambda_m \pi ((\Delta^{-1} r_s)^2 + r^2 - \text{lens}(M_1, M_2))} \right)}{\partial r_s \partial r}, & \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} - 1\right) \leq \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} + 1\right) \\ 4\pi^2 \lambda_m \lambda_s r r_s e^{-\pi(\lambda_m r^2 + \lambda_s r_s^2)}, & \|r\| \geq \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} + 1\right), \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\text{lens}(M_1, M_2)$ denotes the area of the lens formed between the points M_1 and M_2 in Case (B) of Fig. 4.

Proof: See Appendix A ■

B. Small Cell Coverage in IBFD

In this section, the coverage probability of a typical user under P-BS is derived. Coverage under P-BS is denoted as $P_{u,s}^f(T_s, T_b)$ and the corresponding geometry of the node locations is depicted in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5: An instance of user associating with P-BS

A typical user located at the origin o associates with a P-BS (S in Fig. 5) at a distance r_s . From (1), it follows that there is no M-BS inside a ball of radius $OM' = r_s \Delta^{-1}$ centered at the origin o . For the backhaul, the P-BS S connects to the nearest M-BS (M in Fig. 5) at a distance r_m from o . The backhaul distance from the P-BS S to the backhauling M-BS M is r . In IBFD mode, the user when associated with the P-BS, will receive interference from other P-BSs as well as all the M-BSs. Let $g(s, x, \alpha)$ be defined as

$$g(s, x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{1 + s\|x\|^\alpha}.$$

Lemma 3. *The probability of coverage for a user associated with a P-BS in the given two-tier IBFD network is*

$$P_{u,s}^f(T_s, T_b) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{r_s > 0, r > 0} e^{-\lambda_s \int_{\Phi_s \cap A_1^c} 1 - g(s_1, z, \alpha) g(s_2, z - r_s, \alpha) dz - \lambda_m \int_{\Phi_m \cap A_2^c} 1 - g(s'_1, v, \alpha) g(s'_2, v - r_s, \alpha) dv - \beta s_2} g(P_m, r_m, \alpha) f(r_s, r) dr_s dr d\theta, \quad (8)$$

where, $A_1 = B(o, r_s)$, $s_1 = T_s \|r_s\|^\alpha$, $s_2 = \frac{T_b}{P_m} \|r\|^\alpha P_s$, $r_m = \sqrt{r_s^2 + r^2 + 2r_s r \cos \theta}$, $A_2 = (B(o, r_s \Delta^{-1}) \cup B(r_s, \|r\|))$, $s'_1 = \frac{T_s}{P_s} \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m$, and $s'_2 = T_b \|r\|^\alpha$.

Proof: See Appendix B ■

The integral in Lemma 3 can be divided into three integrals over the variables θ, r_s and r corresponding to the cases (A), (B) or (C) of Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. Of particular interest, is the density function of Case (B), where the backhaul and the inner macro discs intersect. Backhaul disc is the one that has distance from the serving P-BS to the serving P-BS's backhauling M-BS as the radius. Though the expression for it has been derived as in (6), it is hard to compute numerically. Therefore, probability for the intersection case is analyzed below.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ denote events *user covered under P-BS* and *intersection of the backhaul and the inner macro discs* of Fig. 3 respectively. Then $\mathcal{I}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{I} \triangleq \|r - \frac{r_s}{\Delta}\| \leq \|r_s\| \leq \|r + \frac{r_s}{\Delta}\|.$$

Using Bayes rule, the probability $\Pr(\mathcal{I} | \mathcal{C})$ is

$$\Pr(\mathcal{I} | \mathcal{C}) = \frac{\Pr(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{I})}{\Pr(\mathcal{C})}. \quad (9)$$

The expressions for $\Pr(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{I})$ and $\Pr(\mathcal{C})$ are already derived in equation (8).

The plot in Fig. 6 reveals useful information about the network topology. For the given system model, at reasonably high biasing towards the P-BS, the system mostly remains in the state of Case (C) of Fig. 3. Therefore, approximate coverage could be evaluated by using system state of Case (C) only, which is much more tractable than using the entire joint density function—a rather complex function to evaluate. The plot also makes practical sense as a HetNet, under general circumstances, would be operated in a mode highly biased towards the P-BSs [23], [24].




Fig. 6: Probability of Network Topology vs. P-BS Bias in Small cell association ($T_m = T_s = T_b = -10$ dB. $B_m = 0$ dB)

Each plot shows the probability of the network being in a particular geometry. Case (A) denotes *Zero Intersect. Prob.* curve that depicts the probability of the inner macro and the backhaul disc having zero intersection, Case (B) (*Intersect Prob.*) curve depicts the probability of the inner macro and the backhaul disc intersecting and Case (C) (*Engulf. Prob.*) curve depicts the probability of the backhaul disc engulfing the inner macro disc in event of small cell association of Fig. 3. Notice that in the region of practical interest, i.e. high bias towards small cell tier, the *Intersect Prob.* curve goes to 0, rendering numerical computations much easier.

C. Macro Cell Coverage in IBFD

Coverage probability for a user associated with an M-BS is derived here. For such a user, there is only a single active link (user-M-BS) since the M-BSs are fiber backhauled to the core network. In this case, it is more convenient to calculate coverage as $\Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m, \varepsilon_m)$ directly rather than the conditional coverage based on the event ε_m .

Lemma 4. *The probability of coverage for a user associated with a M-BS in the given two-tier IBFD network is denoted by $P_{u,m}^f(T_m)$ and is given as*

$$P_{u,m}^f(T_m) = \int_{r'_m=0}^{\infty} \int_{r_s=\Delta r'_m}^{\infty} F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s) f(r'_m, r_s) dr'_m dr_s, \quad (10)$$

where $f(r'_m, r_s)$ denotes the density function of the nearest M-BS and P-BS and is given as:

$$f(r'_m, r_s) = 2\pi\lambda_m r'_m e^{-\pi\lambda_m r'^2_m} 2\pi\lambda_s r_s e^{-\pi\lambda_s r_s^2} \quad (11)$$

and

$$F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s) = e^{-\pi r_m'^2 \lambda_m T_m^{2/\alpha} \int_{T_m^{-2/\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^{\alpha/2}} dt} e^{-\pi r_m'^2 \lambda_s \left(\frac{P_s T_m}{P_m}\right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} \int_{\Delta^2 \left(\frac{P_s T_m}{P_m}\right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^{\alpha/2}} dt}.$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m, \varepsilon_m) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{r_m', r_s} [\Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m \mid r_m', r_s)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{r_m', r_s} \left[\Pr \left(\underbrace{\frac{h P_m r_m'^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{z \in \Phi_m \cap B(o, r_m')^c} P_m h_z \|z\|^{-\alpha} + \sum_{z \in \Phi_s \cap B(o, \Delta r_m')^c} P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha}}_{F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)} > T_m \mid r_m', r_s \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The result in (a) follows as r_s and r_m' are varied so that event ε_m is always true which is in accordance with the limits of integration in (10). Let the interference (denominator) term in (12) be denoted by $I(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)$, where Φ_x could be thought of as the process defining the entire characteristics of tier x . Therefore, $\Phi_m \triangleq \{\lambda_m, P_m, T_m, B_m\}$ and $\Phi_s \triangleq \{\lambda_s, P_s, T_s, B_s\}$. The term $F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)$ is simplified as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s) &= \Pr \left(\frac{h P_m r_m'^{-\alpha}}{I(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)} > T_m \mid r_m', r_s \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{I(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)} \left[e^{-(T_m/P_m) r_m'^{\alpha} I(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)} \mid r_m' \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where, (a) follows from h being a unit mean exponential random variable and $F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)$ being independent of r_s . Continuing further,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\Phi_m, \Phi_s) &= \mathbb{E}_{I(\Phi_m, \Phi_s)} \left[e^{-T_m r_m'^{\alpha} \sum_{z \in \Phi_m \cap B(o, r_m')^c} h_z \|z\|^{-\alpha}} e^{-\frac{T_m}{P_m} P_s r_m'^{\alpha} \sum_{x \in \Phi_s \cap B(o, r_s)} h_x \|x\|^{-\alpha}} \mid r_m' \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{h_z, \Phi_m} \left[\prod_{z \in \Phi_m \cap B(o, r_m')^c} e^{-T_m r_m'^{\alpha} h_z \|z\|^{-\alpha}} \mid r_m' \right] \mathbb{E}_{h_x, \Phi_s} \left[\prod_{x \in \Phi_s \cap B(o, r_s)^c} e^{-\frac{T_m}{P_m} P_s r_m'^{\alpha} h_x \|x\|^{-\alpha}} \mid r_m' \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} e^{-\pi r_m'^2 \lambda_m T_m^{2/\alpha} \int_{T_m^{-2/\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^{\alpha/2}} dt} e^{-\pi r_m'^2 \lambda_s \left(\frac{P_s T_m}{P_m}\right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} \int_{\Delta^2 \left(\frac{P_s T_m}{P_m}\right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^{\alpha/2}} dt}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where (b) follows from the independence of the processes Φ_m and Φ_s and the assumption of fading on links being independent. (c) follows from the coverage result in g in [25]. ■

D. Small Cell Coverage in FDD

In FDD case the frequency resources are orthogonalized between the access and backhaul tiers and so interference to a user in the DL is much reduced. This comes at the cost of halving the spectrum for access and backhaul link each.

Lemma 5. *The probability of coverage for a user associated with a P-BS in the given two-tier FDD network is denoted by $P_{u,s}^h(T_s, T_b)$ and given as*

$$P_{u,s}^h(T_s, T_b) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\lambda_s \int_{z \in A_1^c} 1 - g(\|r_s\|^\alpha T_s, z, \alpha) dz - \lambda_m \int_{v \in A_2^c} 1 - g(\|r\|^\alpha T_b, v - r_s, \alpha) dv} f(r_s, r) dr_s dr, \quad (15)$$

where $g(s, x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{1+s\|x\|^{-\alpha}}$, $A_1 = B(o, r_s)$, $A_2 = (B(o, r_s \Delta^{-1}) \cup B(r_s, \|r\|))$.

Proof:

$$\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid \varepsilon_s) = \mathbb{E}_{r_s, r} \left[\underbrace{\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid r_s, r)}_{P_{u,s}^h(T_s, T_b)} \right].$$

The representation of conditioning on points r_s and r is dropped in interest of better clarity, for the following derivation. For FDD case, the user (or P-BS) receives interference only from the tier that it is associated with.

$$P_{u,s}^h(T_s, T_b) = \Pr \left(\frac{P_s h_{or_s} \|r_s\|^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{z \in A_1^c} P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha}} > T_s, \frac{P_m h_{r_s r_m} \|r\|^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{z \in A_2^c} P_m h_{r_s z} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha}} > T_b \right),$$

Proceeding in the same way as in Appendix B for IBFD coverage, the expression for coverage in the FDD network could be calculated to be as (15). ■

E. Macro Cell Coverage in FDD

Users associated with the macro cells in FDD case see interference only from the macro cells. The coverage expression uses r_m and r_s for nearest P-BS and M-BS respectively as in IBFD macro cell coverage case. So macro cell coverage is calculated as $\Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m, \varepsilon_m)$ directly.

Lemma 6. *The probability of coverage for a user associated with a M-BS in the given two-tier FDD network is denoted by $P_{u,m}^h(T_m)$ and given as,*

$$P_{u,m}^h(T_m) = \int_{r'_m=0}^{\infty} \int_{r_s=\Delta r'_m}^{\infty} e^{-\pi r_m'^2 \lambda_m T_m^{2/\alpha}} \int_{T_m^{-2/\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^{\alpha/2}} dt f(r'_m, r_s) dr'_m dr_s, \quad (16)$$

where $f(r'_m, r_s)$ is defined as in (11).

Proof: Lemma 6 directly follows from the proof given for Lemma 4, considering a user associated with a given tier will receive interference only from that tier. ■

IV. AVERAGE RATE

This section focuses on the the achievable rate for a typical user located at the origin conditioned on the user being under coverage. For full-duplex case the entire $1 Hz$ is used for self-backhauling as well as access links by the P-BSs. At the M-BSs, ηHz is used for the backhauling link to P-BSs and an orthogonal $(1 - \eta) Hz$ for direct access link to the user. The arrangement is similar for half-duplex case, but for the fact that the spectrum is orthogonalized as $0.5 Hz$ each, for access and backhaul links with respect to the P-BSs. Notice that the rate in DL for users connected to the P-BS is the minimum of rates on the M-BS to P-BS and the P-BS to user links. This is taken into account by the derivation that follows. Let an event, that the user is covered, be defined as $\{\text{Coverage}\} \triangleq \mathbf{1}(\varepsilon_m)\{\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m\} \cup \mathbf{1}(\varepsilon_s)\{\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b\}$, where $\mathbf{1}(\varepsilon)$ denotes an indicator random variable for event ε ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_u | \text{Coverage}] &= \frac{1}{\Pr\{\text{Coverage}\}} (\mathbb{E}[R_{um} | \text{SIR}_{um} > T_m] \Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m) + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[\min(R_{us}, R_{sm}) | \text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b] \Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b).) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

A. M-BS to User Rate (R_{um})

The expectation in the first term in (17) is calculated as follows. Let $\bar{\eta} = (1 - \eta)$. Let $\bar{\eta} Hz$ be used at the M-BSs for access to user. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_{um} | \text{SIR}_{um} > T_m] &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{\eta} \log(1 + \text{SIR}_{um}) | \text{SIR}_{um} > T_m] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \bar{\eta} \int_{t \geq 0} \Pr(\log(1 + \text{SIR}_{um}) > t | \text{SIR}_{um} > T_m) dt \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bar{\eta} \int_{t>0} \Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > 2^t - 1 \mid \text{SIR}_{um} > T_m) dt \\
&= \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > T_m)} \int_{t>0} \Pr(\text{SIR}_{um} > \max(2^t - 1, T_m)) dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that the rate R_{um} is a positive random variable. The coverage expression for M-BS-user case, given by (10), can be used in (19) to obtain the average conditional rates.

B. M-BS to P-BS to User Rate ($\min(R_{us}, R_{sm})$)

The expectation in the second term in (17) is computed now. For notational simplicity, let $\{\text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}\} \triangleq \{\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b\}$. On an average, each macro cell is assumed to backhaul n small cells, where $n = \lambda_s/\lambda_m$. This means that on the backhaul link, the rate to each P-BS will get reduced by a factor of n , besides being multiplied by η , which is the amount of bandwidth from 1 Hz , that is allocated by the M-BSs for backhauling P-BSs.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\min(R_{us}, R_{sm}) \mid \text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}] &= \int_{t>0} \Pr(\min(R_{us}, R_{sm}) > t \mid \text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}) dt \\
&= \int_{t>0} \Pr(R_{us} > t, R_{sm} > t \mid \text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}) dt \\
&= \int_{t>0} \Pr\left(\log(1 + \text{SIR}_{us}) > t, \frac{\eta}{n} \log(1 + \text{SIR}_{sm}) > t \mid \text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}\right) dt \\
&= \int_{t>0} \Pr\left(\text{SIR}_{us} > 2^t - 1, \text{SIR}_{sm} > 2^{\frac{nt}{\eta}} - 1 \mid \text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b}\right) dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us,sm} > T_{s,b})} \int_{t>0} \Pr\left(\text{SIR}_{us} > \max(2^t - 1, T_s), \text{SIR}_{sm} > \max(2^{\frac{nt}{\eta}} - 1, T_b)\right) dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The average conditional rate could be similarly calculated for the FDD system keeping note of the fact that the bandwidth gets split into 0.5 Hz each for the backhaul and the access links, which essentially, at least theoretically, must halve the rates for a FDD system in comparison to a IBFD system.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section numerically computes the coverage expressions provided in the previous sections and compares them with Monte Carlo simulations. The parameters used for Monte-Carlo simulation are the same as mentioned in section II-C. Simulation is done with PPPs Φ_s and Φ_m on an area of 50×50 square units with 500 and 125 nodes, respectively. All simulations are shown with the self-interference factor $\beta = 0$, path loss exponent $\alpha = 4$, unless mentioned otherwise. Transmit powers of M-BS and P-BS are proportionally considered as $P_m = 150$ and $P_s = 1$ in accordance with powers of 46 dBm and 24 dBm respectively for wide-area and local-area BS [26]. Bias towards M-BS $B_m = 0$ dB, unless mentioned otherwise.




Fig. 7: Coverage Probability vs. Small Cell Density. ($T_m = T_s = T_b = -10$ dB. $B_s = 34$ dB)

The coverage probability is plotted with respect to different parameters in Fig. 7, Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 and a close match between the simulations and the numerical evaluation of the theoretical expressions is seen. This establishes the validity of the derived analytical framework, that is tractable and quick in computing the network coverage trends in the proposed IBFD self-backhauling network.

The SIR for a typical user in a IBFD self-backhauling network is far lesser than that of its FDD counterpart, which results in much less coverage for a IBFD network. This is primarily because of the inter-tier interference in addition to the intra-tier interferers (intra-tier interference present in FDD network too) in an IBFD network. More biasing towards the P-BS tier requires




Fig. 8: Coverage Probability vs. P-BS Bias. ($T_m = T_s = T_b = -10$ dB)

more backhauling on the same spectrum, eventually resulting in increased interference to the access links.




Fig. 9: Coverage Probability vs. P-BS SIR Threshold. ($T_m = T_b = -10$ dB. $B_s = 34$ dB)




Fig. 10: $T_m = T_b = -10$ dB, $\lambda_s = 4\lambda_m$, $B_s = 22$ dB




Fig. 11: $T_m = T_b = -10$ dB. IBFD Coverage curve varies drastically with B_s

Plots of Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 show the coverage variation versus the P-BS SIR threshold and ratio of densities of P-BS and M-BS. As expected, the coverage for both IBFD and FDD cases decreases with increasing T_s . As T_s is increased, users associated with the P-BS do not get sufficient SIR for coverage. This implies the coverage mostly corresponds to that provided by the M-BS and hence at large values of T_s the two curves in Fig. 10 approach each other.

In Fig. 11, the FDD coverage curve is in accordance with the findings in [25] in that the coverage remains almost constant with increasing density of P-BSs. For the IBFD curve, the findings are different. For high biasing towards P-BS, there is an optimal density that maximizes the coverage, whereas for reasonably lower B_s coverage decreases with increasing P-BS density. The reason is not very apparent by the total coverage plot of Fig. 11, but only by inspecting the coverage got from the individual tiers. It is the coverage under P-BSs that gives the shape of the high B_s plot in Fig. 11. Coverage under P-BS is composed of two probabilities—user coverage under P-BS and the P-BS coverage under a backhauling M-BS as shown in Fig. 12. The plot in Fig. 12 shows the individual coverage probabilities of M-BS to P-BS (backhaul) and P-BS–user links to gain insight into the behavior of the coverage plot. The net coverage under P-BS is plotted as the product of these probabilities. These plots bring out fundamental scaling trends in such a self-backhauling network. They show that the net coverage under P-BS increases with P-BS density till an optimum is reached. This is because during this increase in density, effective bias towards the P-BS increases and more users associate and subsequently get covered under P-BSs, albeit with lower SIR.




Fig. 12: $T_m = T_b = -10$ dB, $\lambda_s = 4\lambda_m$, $B_s = 22$ dB $\Rightarrow P_s B_s = P_m B_m$




Fig. 13: $T_m = T_b = T_s = -10$ dB. M-BS Coverage with varying B_s

Moreover, there is scope for the M-BSs to cater to more P-BSs for backhauling. The result is an increase in coverage. Beyond the optimum coverage point, user coverage under P-BSs starts to stagnate but the backhauling coverage drops steeply. Stagnation in P-BS to user coverage is due to the fact that at high P-BS density, users mostly associate with P-BS. Then, the network behaves as if a single tier network with increasing BS density which is known to be constant [25]. On the other hand the backhaul coverage drops due to the increasing interference that the access links of the P-BS pose to the backhaul links of the P-BS. This effectively results in an overall decrease in the coverage under P-BSs. The same is not true of the FDD counterpart of such a network. In FDD case, backhauling links do not interfere with the access links. With increasing P-BS density, an increasing P-BS coverage balances a declining M-BS coverage to give an almost constant net coverage.

The plot of Fig 14 shows that coverage remains almost constant with increasing P_m within reasonable limits of operation of a wide-area BS [26]. This is an important result since it has a bearing on the energy efficiency of the proposed architecture. It shows that the M-BS could be operated at lower powers without adversely affecting the coverage. The result resonates well with the findings in [27], except the fact that the authors orthogonalize resources between access and backhaul, whereas the proposed architecture leverages IBFD capability to do away with that limitation. As expected, Fig. 15 shows the degradation of coverage with increasing self-interference factor at the P-BS.




Fig. 14: $T_m = T_b = -10$ dB, $\lambda_s = 4\lambda_m$, $B_s = 22$ dB $\Rightarrow P_s B_s = P_m B_m$




Fig. 15: $T_m = T_b = T_s = -10$ dB. M-BS Coverage with varying β




Fig. 16: $T_m = T_b = T_s = -10$ dB, $\lambda_s = 4\lambda_m$, $B_m = 0$ dB

The plot in Fig. 16 shows the coverage remains almost constant, till the received biased power from both the tiers becomes same. Beyond this, biasing more towards the P-BS forces the users to associate with them even when the SIR received from them is lesser than that from the M-BS. This results in decrease in coverage until a point where mostly all users are associated with the P-BS tier only and therefore the coverage stagnates. The plot also suggests that the decrease in coverage in the IBFD case is much steeper than in the FDD case. This is because in the IBFD case, the small cell tier receives the maximum interference; from other M-BSs as well as all the

P-BSs. For a user to be biased in associating with a P-BS in a IBFD case is essentially forcing it to accept a much weaker SIR link than in the case of FDD operation. Hence the coverage for a user in IBFD operation degrades much more rapidly than in the FDD case.

The following plots show the variation of average conditional rate of a typical user in a IBFD and FDD self-backhauling network. All rates are calculated keeping the bandwidth partitioning parameter $\eta = 0.9$. Since the available bandwidth is entirely used by the P-BSs and M-BSs in IBFD network, the rate in IBFD networks, typically tends to twice that of FDD networks. As the interference in IBFD network is more than the conventional FDD network, the rate is not twice that of the FDD networks.




Fig. 17: $T_m = T_b = -10$ dB, $\lambda_s = 4\lambda_m$




Fig. 18: $T_m = T_b = T_s = -10$ dB, $B_s = 22$ dB

The plots in Fig. 17 and Fig. 18 show the variation of rate with varying T_s and λ_s . As expected, the average normalized rate increases with increasing T_s and decreases with increasing P-BS density. In Fig. 18, increasing P-BS density reduces the backhaul bandwidth per P-BS and the rate (which is the minimum over backhaul and access link) also reduces. Thus, the interference from the backhaul to the access links as well as the division of bandwidth at the backhauling M-BS, are two major limitations in the considered IBFD self-backhauling network.

The plot in Fig. 17 shows that with $\eta = 0.9$, there exists a bias point that achieves the maximum average rate. Since the density of P-BSs is four times that of M-BSs, there exists a point where all the P-BSs are fully utilized to deliver rate to the typical user and hence the shape of the curve. Beyond this point, as the users are forced to associate to a weaker SIR link from the P-BS, the average rate begins to fall. The results obtained in this section indicate two major impediments to achieving the full potential of IBFD self-backhauling networks that are




Fig. 19: Covered Rate vs. Bandwidth Shairng at M-BS. ($T_m = T_s = T_b = -10$ dB. $B_s = 22$ dB)

inter-tier interference from the backhaul to access links and *bandwidth division* at the M-BS to accommodate backhauling resources for multiple P-BSs.

These limitations could be countered by using large antenna MIMO in backhauling. The large antenna array could provide form narrow beams directed precisely towards the P-BSs, thereby reducing interference in the backhaul as well as access links. Furthermore, such a backhaul link could be thought of as a MIMO broadcast channel with the M-BS serving multiple P-BSs using its many antennas, thereby getting rid of the $1/n$ bandwidth division factor. Another approach could be though of, which could potentially do away with the bandwidth partitioning factor η at the M-BSs. This could be achieved if the M-BSs are also IBFD-enabled and use the opposite pair of frequencies in the access and backhaul networks.

VI. CONCLUSION

This work proposed and analyzed a self-backhauling HetNet architecture for IBFD as well as traditional FDD enabled base-stations. A tractable and quick-to-compute analytical model for network wide coverage and average rates is derived and shown to match simulation results. The paper shows that the proposed IBFD self-backhauling network suffers from limitations posed by the inter-tier interference and the bandwidth division at the backhauling M-BS. Though IBFD capability helps improve the average rates (conditioned on user being covered) by a factor less

than double, the coverage in such a network is close to half of its FDD counterpart. To leverage the full potential of IBFD capability, it needs to be complemented with other 5G technologies such as large-scale MIMO and millimeter wave networks, that could improve the inter-tier and intra-tier interference as well as help do away with bandwidth sharing occurring in the backhaul links. The proposed architecture requires only small cells to be IBFD-enabled, though the M-BS and user equipments could continue being legacy ones. Also, the paper uses an example IBFD network for exposition, but similar analysis holds for time-division duplexed (TDD) networks, for instance, by replacing frequencies f_1 and f_2 by time-slots t_1 and t_2 .

REFERENCES

- [1] METIS, “Mobile and wireless communications Enablers for the Twenty-twenty Information Society,” tech. rep., EU 7th Framework Programme Project, Mar. 2013.
- [2] A. Damnjanovic, J. Montojo, Y. Wei, T. Ji, T. Luo, M. Vajapeyam, T. Yoo, O. Song, and D. Malladi, “A survey on 3gpp heterogeneous networks,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE*, vol. 18, pp. 10–21, June 2011.
- [3] ETSI, “LTE;Scenarios and requirements for small cell enhancements for E-UTRA and E-UTRAN, 3GPP TR 36.932 version 12.1.0 Release 12,” TR 36.932, European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), Oct. 2014.
- [4] R. Schwartz and M. Rice, “Rethinking Small Cell Backhaul,” tech. rep., Wireless2020, July 2012.
- [5] M. Jain, J. I. Choi, T. Kim, D. Bharadia, S. Seth, K. Srinivasan, P. Levis, S. Katti, and P. Sinha, “Practical, real-time, full duplex wireless,” in *Proceedings of the 17th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, MobiCom ’11*, (New York, NY, USA), pp. 301–312, ACM, 2011.
- [6] M. Duarte and A. Sabharwal, “Full-duplex wireless communications using off-the-shelf radios: Feasibility and first results,” in *Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR), 2010 Conference Record of the Forty Fourth Asilomar Conference on*, pp. 1558–1562, Nov 2010.
- [7] S. Hong, J. Brand, J. Choi, M. Jain, J. Mehlman, S. Katti, and P. Levis, “Applications of self-interference cancellation in 5g and beyond,” *Communications Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 52, pp. 114–121, February 2014.
- [8] B. Li and P. Liang, “Small cell in-band wireless backhaul in massive MIMO systems: A cooperation of next-generation techniques,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1402.2603, 2014.
- [9] I. Atzeni and M. Kountouris, “Full-duplex mimo small-cell networks: Performance analysis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05506*, 2015.
- [10] S. Goyal, P. Liu, S. Hua, and S. Panwar, “Analyzing a full-duplex cellular system,” in *Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), 2013 47th Annual Conference on*, pp. 1–6, March 2013.
- [11] H. Kim, S. Lim, H. Wang, and D. Hong, “Optimal power allocation and outage analysis for cognitive full duplex relay systems,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, pp. 3754–3765, October 2012.
- [12] S. Barghi, A. Khojastepour, K. Sundaresan, and S. Rangarajan, “Characterizing the throughput gain of single cell mimo wireless systems with full duplex radios,” in *Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc and Wireless Networks (WiOpt), 2012 10th International Symposium on*, pp. 68–74, May 2012.
- [13] H. Ju, S. Lim, D. Kim, H. Poor, and D. Hong, “Full duplexity in beamforming-based multi-hop relay networks,” *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 30, pp. 1554–1565, September 2012.

- [14] V. Aggarwal, M. Duarte, A. Sabharwal, and N. Shankaranarayanan, “Full- or half-duplex? a capacity analysis with bounded radio resources,” in *Information Theory Workshop (ITW), 2012 IEEE*, pp. 207–211, Sept 2012.
- [15] T. Riihonen, S. Werner, and R. Wichman, “Hybrid full-duplex/half-duplex relaying with transmit power adaptation,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 10, pp. 3074–3085, September 2011.
- [16] S. Singh, M. Kulkarni, A. Ghosh, and J. Andrews, “Tractable model for rate in self-backhauled millimeter wave cellular networks,” 2014.
- [17] D. Stoyan, W. Kendall, J. Mecke, and D. Kendall, *Stochastic Geometry and Its Applications*. John Wiley and Sons, 1996.
- [18] R. K. Ganti, “Stochastic geometry and wireless networks,” 2012.
- [19] H. Dhillon, R. , F. Baccelli, and J. Andrews, “Modeling and analysis of k-tier downlink heterogeneous cellular networks,” *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 30, pp. 550–560, April 2012.
- [20] H.-S. Jo, Y. J. Sang, P. Xia, and J. Andrews, “Heterogeneous cellular networks with flexible cell association: A comprehensive downlink sinr analysis,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, pp. 3484–3495, October 2012.
- [21] M. Duarte, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, “Experiment-driven characterization of full-duplex wireless systems,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, pp. 4296–4307, December 2012.
- [22] M. K. Simon and M.-S. Alouini, *Digital communication over fading channels*, vol. 95. John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- [23] A. Damnjanovic, J. Montojo, Y. Wei, T. Ji, T. Luo, M. Vajapeyam, T. Yoo, O. Song, and D. Malladi, “A survey on 3gpp heterogeneous networks,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 10–21, 2011.
- [24] P. T. Airpsan, “Small Cell LTE Deployments Tightly Integrating Access and Backhaul,” tech. rep., Small Cells Americas, November 2012.
- [25] J. Andrews, F. Baccelli, and R. Ganti, “A tractable approach to coverage and rate in cellular networks,” *Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, pp. 3122–3134, November 2011.
- [26] 3GPP, “3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Base Station (BS) radio transmission and reception (Release 13),” TS 36.104, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), July 2015.
- [27] H. Yang, G. Geraci, and T. Q. S. Quek, “Energy efficient design of mimo heterogeneous networks with wireless backhaul,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05506*, 2015.
- [28] E. W. Weisstein, “Circle-circle intersection, from mathworld—a wolfram web resource,”

APPENDIX A

JOINT PDF OF DISTANCE PAIR (r_s, r)

The joint pdf of the distance pair (r_s, r) that characterizes the joint density of the access-backhaul nodes is derived here.

1) $\Delta \geq 1$: Considered first is the arrangement as shown in Fig. 3. The representations in Fig. 3 depict cases depending on the location of the backhauling M-BS, provided the user associates with the P-BS at a point r_s . Parts (A), (B) and (C) represent cases where the backhaul disc (circle with radius $\|r\|$) and the inner macro disc (circle with radius denoted by $OM' = \Delta^{-1}r_s$)

- do not intersect

- have finite intersection area
- represent a single disc (i.e. the backhaul disc engulfs the inner macro disc)

Following this, the pdf is composed of three sub-parts depending on where the backhauling M-BS is found.

- *Case (A):* $0 < \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ In this case the density function is given by the void probabilities [17] of Φ_s over $\Phi_s \cap B(o, \|r_s\|)^c$ and of Φ_m over $\Phi_m \cap (B(o, \|\Delta^{-1}r_s\|) \cup B(r_s, \|r\|)^c)$ i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} f(r_s, r) &= \frac{\partial F(r_s, r)}{\partial r_s \partial r} \\ &= \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\lambda_s \pi r_s^2} e^{\lambda_m \pi ((\Delta^{-1}r_s)^2 + r^2)} \right)}{\partial r_s \partial r} \\ &= \frac{4\pi^2 \lambda_m (\Delta^2 \lambda_s + \lambda_m) r r_s e^{-\pi (\lambda_m r^2 + (\lambda_s + \lambda_m / \Delta^2) r_s^2)}}{\Delta^2} . \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

- *Case (B):* $\|r_s\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \leq \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ This case has a finite intersection area between the backhaul disc and the inner macro disc. Thus the void probabilities and so the density is calculated as follows.

$$f(r_s, r) = \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\lambda_s \pi r_s^2} e^{\lambda_m \pi ((\Delta^{-1}r_s)^2 + r^2 - \text{len}(M_1, M_2))} \right)}{\partial r_s \partial r} , \quad (22)$$

where $\text{len}(M_1, M_2)$ denotes the area of the lens formed between points M_1 and M_2 of Fig. 3 (part (B)) and is given as in [28].

- *Case (C):* $\|r\| \geq \|r_s\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ This case has the backhaul disc completely engulf the inner macro disc and the density is given as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} f(r_s, r) &= \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\lambda_s \pi r_s^2} e^{\lambda_m \pi r^2} \right)}{\partial r_s \partial r} \\ &= 4\pi^2 \lambda_m \lambda_s r r_s e^{-\pi (\lambda_m r^2 + \lambda_s r_s^2)} . \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

2) $0 < \Delta < 1$: For this case the radii of the discs depicted in Fig. 3 change as $r_s/\Delta > r_s$. Similar three cases are depicted in Fig. 4.

- *Case (A):* $0 < \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} - 1\right)$ This case is a zero probability case since it is already known that there is no M-BS within radius $\frac{\|r_s\|}{\Delta}$.
- *Case (B):* $\|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} - 1\right) \leq \|r\| < \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} + 1\right)$ Equation (22) could directly be used to give this density function.

- *Case (C):* $\|r\| \geq \|r_s\| \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} + 1\right)$ This case is similar to the engulfment case as *Case (C)* for $\Delta \geq 1$. Hence, the third part of the density function of Equation (23) could directly be used.

APPENDIX B

SMALL CELL COVERAGE PROBABILITY

Coverage probability of a user, given it is associated to a small cell is derived here. The coverage probability is denoted by $\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid \varepsilon_s)$.

$$\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid \varepsilon_s) = \mathbb{E}_{r_s, r} \left[\underbrace{\Pr(\text{SIR}_{us} > T_s, \text{SIR}_{sm} > T_b \mid r_s, r)}_{P'_{u,s}(T_s, T_b)} \right] \quad (24)$$

where, r_s and r denote the points of Fig. 5 and are varied over a region so that the event ε_s of equation (5) is always true.

The inner probability term of equation (24) is derived below. In interest of better clarity, the representation of conditioning on points r_s and r is dropped in the following derivation.

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{u,s}(T_s, T_b) &= \Pr \left(\frac{P_s h_{or_s} \|r_s\|^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{z \in A_1^c} P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha} + \sum_{z \in A_2^c} P_m h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha} + P_m h_{or_m} \|r_m\|^{-\alpha}} > T_s, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{P_m h_{r_s r_m} \|r\|^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{z \in A_1^c} P_s h_{r_s z} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha} + \sum_{z \in A_2^c} P_m h_{r_s z} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha} + \beta P_s} > T_b \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr(h_{or_s} > k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha I_1, h_{r_s r_m} > k_m \|r\|^\alpha I_2), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) results by taking $k_s = T_s/P_s$ and $k_m = T_b/P_m$ and I_1 and I_2 are short notations for interference terms in SIR_{us} and SIR_{sm} terms. Areas A_1 and A_2 are as defined in (8). Following from the result above,

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{u,s}(T_s, T_b) &= \mathbb{E}_{I_1, I_2} [\Pr(h_{or_s} > k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha I_1, h_{r_s r_m} > k_m \|r\|^\alpha I_2 \mid I_1, I_2)] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{I_1, I_2} [\Pr(h_{or_s} > k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha I_1) \Pr(h_{r_s r_m} > k_m \|r\|^\alpha I_2) \mid I_1, I_2] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{I_1, I_2} [e^{-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha I_1} e^{-k_m \|r\|^\alpha I_2} \mid I_1, I_2] \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{h_{oz}, h_{r_s z}, \Phi_s} \left[\prod_{z \in A_1^c} e^{(-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha})} e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_s h_{r_s z} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{h_{oz}, h_{orm}, h_{rsz}, \Phi_m} \left[\prod_{z \in A_2^c} e^{(-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m (h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha} + h_{orm} \|r_m\|^{-\alpha})} e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_m h_{rsz} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} \right] e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha \beta P_s)}.$$

Assumption of independently fading links gives result to (b). Result in (c) is based on the assumption of fading power being exponentially fading with unit mean. Expanding I_1 , I_2 and separating terms belonging to the independent processes Φ_m and Φ_s , the result is as given by (d). Simplifying further,

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{u,s}(T_s, T_b) &\stackrel{(e)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{h_{oz}, h_{rsz}, \Phi_s} \left[\prod_{z \in A_1^c} e^{(-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_s h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha})} e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_s h_{rsz} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} \right] \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{h_{oz}, h_{rsz}, \Phi_m} \left[\prod_{z \in A_2^c} e^{(-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m (h_{oz} \|z\|^{-\alpha})} e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_m h_{rsz} \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} \right] \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{h_{orm}} \left[e^{-k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m h_{orm} \|r_m\|^{-\alpha}} \right] e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha \beta P_s)} \\ &\stackrel{(f)}{=} \exp \left(-\lambda_s \int_{z \in A_1^c} 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_s \|z\|^{-\alpha})(1 + k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_s \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} dz \right) \\ &\quad \exp \left(-\lambda_m \int_{z \in A_2^c} 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m \|z\|^{-\alpha})(1 + k_m \|r\|^\alpha P_m \|z - r_s\|^{-\alpha})} dz \right) \\ &\quad e^{(-k_m \|r\|^\alpha \beta P_s)} \left(\frac{1}{1 + k_s \|r_s\|^\alpha P_m \|r_m\|^{-\alpha}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Result in (e) simply follows from (d) by separating terms that depend on either Φ_m or Φ_s and the ones that do not. The final step in (f) uses the probability generating functional [18] of a PPP and the result of the work in [25], as was used in (14). Plugging the result of (f) in (24) and substituting the expectation with the pdf $f(r_s, r)$ gives the result of (8).